



03 AUG 2006

Patrick O'Shea
O'Shea Getz & Kosakowski
1500 Main Street
Suite 912
Springfield MA 01115

In re Application of
SCHANZ et al.
Application No.: 10/526,233
PCT No.: PCT/EP03/09481
Int. Filing Date: 27 August 2003
Priority Date: 28 August 2002
Attorney's Docket No.: 2000-0001
For: CONTROL SYSTEM FOR LIGHT TUBES :

:
:
: DECISION ON
:
: PETITION
:
: UNDER 37 CFR 1.47(b)
:

This is a decision on petition under 37 CFR 1.47(b), filed 11 April 2006 to permit petitioner (applicant) to file the above-captioned application on behalf of the non-signing inventors Christian Schanz and Matthias Rupprecht. Petitioner requests a four month extension of time, which is granted.

BACKGROUND

On 27 August 2003, applicant filed international application No. PCT/EP03/09481 which claimed a priority date of 28 August 2002, and which designated the United States. A copy of the international application was communicated to the United States by the International Bureau on 25 March 2004.

On 28 February 2005, within 30 months from the priority date, applicant filed a transmittal letter for entry into the national stage in the United States which was accompanied by, *inter alia*, basic national filing fee.

On 05 October 2005, the United States Designated/Elected Office (DO/EO/US) mailed a NOTIFICATION OF MISSING REQUIREMENTS indicating that the oath or declaration of the inventor, in compliance with 37 CFR 1.497(a) and (b) must be furnished within two months from the mail date of the notice or the application would be abandoned. Extensions of time were available.

On 11 April 2006, petitioner filed the instant petition requesting that the above-identified application be accepted under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.47(b). The petition was accompanied by an unexecuted declaration and a copy of an unexecuted Assignment.

DISCUSSION

A petition under 37 CFR 1.47(b) must be accompanied by (1) the requisite petition fee, (2) factual proof that the inventor refuses to execute the application or cannot be reached after diligent effort, (3) a statement of the last known address of the inventor, (4) an oath or declaration by the 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant on behalf of and as agent for the non-signing inventor, (5) proof

that the 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant has sufficient proprietary interest in the application, and (6) a showing that such action is necessary to preserve the rights of the parties or to prevent irreparable damage.

Petitioner has satisfied Item (1) with payment of the requisite petition fee and Item (3) with a statement of the last known address of the inventors.

With regard to Item (2), petitioner has not provided any proof that the joint inventors refuse or are unavailable to sign the application. See MPEP. 409.03(d), which states in pertinent part, "a refusal by an inventor to sign an oath or declaration when the inventor has not been presented with the application papers does not itself suggest that the inventor is refusing to join the application unless it is clear that the inventor understands exactly what he or she is being asked to sign and refuses to accept the application papers." Here, there is no evidence that the inventors were presented with a copy of the application papers and thus, there is insufficient evidence to conclude that the inventor refuses to sign the application. The statement of someone having first hand knowledge of the facts is required. See MPEP. 409.03(d) for further instructions. Item (2) is not satisfied.

As for Item (4), petitioner has not provided a declaration executed on behalf of the inventors by the 37 CFR 1.47(b) petitioner. Thus, the declaration does not fulfill the requirements of 37 CFR 1.497(a) and (b). Item (4) is not satisfied.

Regarding Item (5), Section 409.03(f) of the MPEP, **Proof of Proprietary Interest**, states, in part:

When an application is deposited pursuant to 37 CFR 1.47(b), the 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant must prove that

- (A) the invention has been assigned to the applicant, or
- (B) the inventor has agreed in writing to assign the invention to the applicant, or
- (C) the applicant otherwise has sufficient proprietary interest in the subject matter to justify the filing of the application.

If the application has been assigned, a copy of the assignment (in the English Language) must be submitted. The assignment must clearly indicate that the invention described in the 37 CFR 1.47(b) application was assigned to the 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant. A statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) by the assignee must also be submitted (see MPEP § 324)....

When an inventor has agreed in writing to assign an invention described in an application deposited pursuant to 37 CFR 1.47(b), a copy of that agreement should be submitted. If an agreement to assign is dependent on certain specified conditions being met, it must be established by a statement of facts by someone with first hand knowledge of the circumstances in which those conditions have been met. A typical agreement to assign is an employment agreement where an employee (nonsigning inventor) agrees to assign to his or her employer (37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant) all inventions made during employment. When such an agreement is relied on, it must be established by the affidavit or declaration of a person having firsthand knowledge of the facts that the invention was made by the employee while employed by the 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant.

If the invention has not been assigned, or if there is no written agreement to assign, the 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant must demonstrate that he or she otherwise has a sufficient proprietary interest in the matter.

A proprietary interest obtained other than by assignment or agreement to assign may be demonstrated by an appropriate legal memorandum to the effect that a court of competent jurisdiction (federal, state, or foreign) would by the weight of authority in that jurisdiction award title of the invention to the 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant. The facts in support of any conclusion that a court would award title to the 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant should be made of record by way of an affidavit or declaration of the person having firsthand knowledge of same. The legal memorandum should be prepared and signed by an attorney at law familiar with the law of the jurisdiction involved. A copy (in the English language) of a statute (if other than the United States statute) or a court decision (if other than a reported decision of a federal court or a decision reported in the United States Patents Quarterly) relied on to demonstrate a proprietary interest should be made of record.

Here, petitioner is attempting to prove that the 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant has sufficient proprietary interest in the subject matter to justify filing the application. The assignment attached to the petition is defective to prove this interest because the assignment provided is not signed by the inventors.

Nor has Petitioner provided an employment agreement where an employee (nonsigning inventor) agrees to assign to his or her employer (37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant) all inventions made during employment and a firsthand knowledge statement that the invention was made by the employee while employed by the 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant.

Where there is no written agreement to assign or the invention has not been assigned, petitioner must demonstrate a proprietary interest by an appropriate legal memorandum. No such memorandum accompanied the petition. As stated above and reiterated here, an appropriate legal memorandum to the effect that a court of competent jurisdiction (federal, state, or foreign) would by the weight of authority in that jurisdiction award title of the invention to the 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant is required. The facts in support of any conclusion that a court would award title to the 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant should be made of record by way of an affidavit or declaration of the person having firsthand knowledge of the same. The legal memorandum should be prepared and signed by an attorney at law familiar with the law of the jurisdiction involved. A copy (in the English language) of a statute (if other than the United States statute) or a court decision (if other than a reported decision of a federal court or a decision reported in the United States Patents Quarterly) relied on to demonstrate a proprietary interest should be made of record. A statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) by the assignee must also be submitted. Item (5) is not satisfied.

As for Item (6), irreparable damage may be established by a showing (a statement) that a filing date is necessary to preserve the rights of the party and to prevent irreparable damage." No such statement has been presented. Thus, item (6) is not yet satisfied.

Accordingly, items (2), (4), (5) and (6) above have not been satisfied and the petition under 37 CFR 1.47(b) must be dismissed.

CONCLUSION

The petition under 37 CFR 1.47(b) is **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.


If reconsideration on the merits of this petition is desired, a proper response must be filed within TWO (2) MONTHS from the mail date of this decision. Any reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition Under 37 CFR 1.47(b)." No additional

Application No.: 10/526,233

4

petition fee is required. Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Any further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed to the Mail Stop PCT, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, with the contents of the letter marked to the attention of the Office of PCT Legal Administration.



Cynthia M. Kratz
Attorney Advisor
PCT Legal Office

Tel: 571-272-3286
Fax: 571-273-0459